



## Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee

**Date:** WEDNESDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2022  
**Time:** 11.00 am  
**Venue:** COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

**Members:** Alderman Timothy Hailes (Chair) Deputy Christopher Hayward  
Deputy Rehana Ameer (Deputy Chairman) Deputy Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Randall Anderson Deputy Edward Lord  
Deputy Keith Bottomley Paul Martinelli  
Deputy Michael Cassidy Anett Rideg  
Deputy Madush Gupta

**Enquiries:** Polly Dunn  
Polly.Dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

### Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:  
<https://youtu.be/VH-tBOLn2qk>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

**John Barradell**  
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

# AGENDA

NB: Certain items presented for information have been marked \* and will be taken without discussion, unless the Committee Clerk has been informed that a Member has questions or comments prior to the start of the meeting. These for information items have been collated into a supplementary agenda pack and circulated separately.

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 23 November 2022.

**For Decision**  
(To Follow)

4. **TECHNICAL CLARIFICATIONS TO THE PROCUREMENT CODE**

Report of the Chief Operating Officer.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 5 - 8)

5. **GW2: EPPING FOREST: COVID-19 DAMAGE TO SHARED USE TRAIL NETWORK**

Report of the Executive Director of Environment.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 9 - 24)

6. **\*CLIMATE ACTION STRATEGY (CAS) NZ1, NZ3 AND RS3 WORKSTREAM UPDATE FOR THE OPERATIONAL PORTFOLIO**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Information**

7. **\*CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME - MID-YEAR PROGRESS REPORT**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Information**

8. **\*22/23 ENERGY & DECARBONISATION PERFORMANCE Q2 UPDATE FOR THE OPERATIONAL PORTFOLIO**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Information**
9. **\*GW5 (ISSUES) - BEECH STREET TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC REALM PROJECT**  
Report of the Executive Director of Environment.
- For Information**
10. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**
11. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**
12. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**  
**MOTION** - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item(s) on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.
- For Decision**
13. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**  
To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2022.
- For Decision**  
(To Follow)
14. **WALBROOK WHARF STRATEGIC PURCHASE OPPORTUNITY**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 25 - 44)
15. **GW2: CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT - CELL AREA DUCTING AND EXTRACT SYSTEM BALANCING**  
Report of the City Surveyor.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 45 - 64)

16. **GW3: BARBICAN FIRE SAFETY**  
Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 65 - 74)

17. **GW4C: GUILDHALL COOLING PLANT REPLACEMENT**  
Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 75 - 120)

18. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB  
COMMITTEE**

19. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH  
THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE  
PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

<b>Committee(s):</b> Operational Property & Projects Sub Committee	<b>Dated:</b> 14/12/2022
<b>Subject:</b> Technical Clarifications to the Procurement Code	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	4, 5, 6,11
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Emma Moore, Chief Operating Officer	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Genine Whitehorne, Commercial Director	

## Summary

The **Procurement Code** is the policy which underpins all procurement and purchasing activity across the City Corporation including our institutional departments. Procurement policies are reviewed annually to ensure they are up to date and still operationally viable. Following a consultation process, the most recent set of revisions to the Procurement Code were approved by Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee, Finance Committee and Court of Common Council in September, November and December 2022 respectively. These revisions support the efficiency principles under the Target Operating Model (TOM) specifically to align activity and resources to our corporate outcomes; increase the pace of decision making; and achieve cost savings to resolve budget deficit.

In accordance with Standing Order 51, approval is being sought to make technical clarifications to Procurement Code in order to provide further clarification to procurement processes. This is not a request for a policy change.

## Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Approve two technical clarifications to the procurement processes contained in rule 15 of the revised Procurement Code effective from **3 January 2023**.

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. The Procurement Code is the policy which underpins all procurement and purchasing activity across the City Corporation and the institutional departments. Part 1 of the Procurement Code is the framework of overarching rules to be followed by any officer when purchasing goods, services or works and has been developed in line with UK Public Contracts Regulations 2015. Part 2 of the Procurement Code is the guidance document which provides context, processes, and further information relevant to compliance with the rules outlined in Part 1.
2. Procurement policies are reviewed regularly to ensure they are up-to-date and still operationally viable. Following a consultation process, the proposed revisions support the efficiency principles under the TOM specifically to align activity and resources to our corporate outcomes; increase the pace of decision making; achieve cost savings to resolve budget deficit.
3. Following a consultation process, the most recent set of revisions to the Procurement Code were approved by Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee, Finance Committee and Court of Common Council in September, November and December 2022 respectively.

### **Current Position**

4. Standing Order 51 provides that Finance Committee is responsible for authorising any technical adjustments to the Procurement Code and only significant changes need approval by Court of Common Council.
5. It is requested that Members of the Operational Projects and Projects Sub-Committee approve two minor clarifications to the procurement processes in the table in rule 15 of the Procurement Code on behalf of Finance Committee.
6. This is not a request for approval for a policy change. Rather, approval is sought to make technical adjustments to clarify that procurements for goods and services over £100,000 and works contracts at £400,000 or more will be subject to an options appraisal by the Commercial Service. This is in line with current policy.
7. The technical adjustments to the table in rule 15 of the Procurement Code are highlighted below:

**Table 1 Procurement Thresholds and Procedures**

Type of Procurement	Goods & Services	Works	Guidance
Operational Purchasing	Up to £100,000	Up to £100,000	Officers may seek quotations directly from suppliers in accordance with the process outlined in Part 2. Once a quotation has been obtained, a requisition must be created on iProcurement and submitted to the Commercial Service who will issue a Purchase Order to the selected supplier. Where a Corporate Contract exists, it must be used.
One-off Purchasing	<del>More than £100,000, but less than FTS</del> threshold for goods and services	More than £100,000 but less than £400,000	Request for Quotation must be undertaken by the Commercial Service through the eTendering portal. A minimum of three firms to be invited to submit written quotations one of which should be a local firm, SME, or a Social Enterprise.
Strategic Purchasing	<del>FTS threshold for goods and services or more</del>  More than £100,000	£400,000 or more	Options Appraisal must be undertaken by the Commercial Service. Any resulting procurement must go through the tendering portal.

### Corporate & Strategic Implications

There are none.

### Conclusion

8. The Commercial Service recommend the approval of two technical clarifications to rule 15 of the Procurement Code as outlined in this report to be effective from **3 January 2023**.

### Appendices

There are none.

### Genine Whitehorne

Commercial Director, The Commercial Service

E: [genine.whitehorne@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:genine.whitehorne@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



<b>Committees:</b> Operational Property & Projects Sub Committee - for decision	<b>Dates:</b> 14 December 2022
<b>Subject:</b> Epping Forest: COVID-19 damage to Shared Use Trail network  <b>Unique Project Identifier:</b> <i>PV ID confirmed post CPB via PMO.</i>	<b>Gateway 2:</b> <b>Project Proposal</b> Regular
<b>Report of:</b> Executive Director Environment <b>Report Author:</b> Geoff Sinclair	<b>For Decision</b>
<h1 style="margin: 0;">PUBLIC</h1>	

## Recommendations

<b>1. Next steps and requested decisions</b>	<p><b>Project Description:</b> <i>This project seeks to address significant Health &amp; Safety liabilities and repair widespread environmental damage caused by the abnormally high visitor use of shared-use trails at Epping Forest during the COVID-19 lockdown period through undertaking a program of path works to repair damage and to reduce further pressure on sensitive areas.</i></p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> Capital bid approved for 2022/23</p> <p><b>Next Gateway:</b> Gateway 3/4 - Options Appraisal (Regular)</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Formal consents from Natural England and Local Authorities where an Archaeological Protection Area applies</i></li> <li>• <i>Works tender prepared for identified works</i></li> <li>• <i>Works procured through City Procurement team working with the COL Highways Term contractor in the first instance</i></li> <li>• <i>Successful procurement confirmed</i></li> <li>• <i>Final work program confirmed</i></li> <li>• <i>Gateway 3/4 report submitted</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Requested Decisions:</b></p>
--	---

	<p>Operational Property &amp; Projects Sub Committee</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This Gateway report is seeking approval for the Epping Forest: <i>COVID-19 damage to Shared Use Trail network project proposal</i> to undertake the evaluation and design of the options presented in Section 9.</li> <li>2. Note that funding is subject to the capital programme review and the final decision on whether to proceed will be dependent on the outcome of that review and approval by the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee.</li> </ol> <p>Epping Forest and Commons Committee</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That members approve the proposal to progress the evaluation and design of options as presented in Section 9</li> </ol>																								
<p><b>2. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</b></p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="528 824 1390 1771"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff Time to seek statutory consents</td> <td>Required to progress works in SSS! and APAs</td> <td>Local Risk 2 days @ £250/day</td> <td>500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff time to compile works tender</td> <td>Required to progress works costing</td> <td>Local Risk 4 days @£250/day</td> <td>1000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff time to undertake works procurement</td> <td>Required to progress works costing</td> <td>Local Risk 4days @£250/day</td> <td>1000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff time to compile final work program</td> <td>To confirm a work program within budget</td> <td>Local Risk 1 day @ £250/day</td> <td>250</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2750</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: N/A</b> (as detailed in the Risk Register – Appendix 2)</p>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Staff Time to seek statutory consents	Required to progress works in SSS! and APAs	Local Risk 2 days @ £250/day	500	Staff time to compile works tender	Required to progress works costing	Local Risk 4 days @£250/day	1000	Staff time to undertake works procurement	Required to progress works costing	Local Risk 4days @£250/day	1000	Staff time to compile final work program	To confirm a work program within budget	Local Risk 1 day @ £250/day	250	<b>Total</b>			2750
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)																						
Staff Time to seek statutory consents	Required to progress works in SSS! and APAs	Local Risk 2 days @ £250/day	500																						
Staff time to compile works tender	Required to progress works costing	Local Risk 4 days @£250/day	1000																						
Staff time to undertake works procurement	Required to progress works costing	Local Risk 4days @£250/day	1000																						
Staff time to compile final work program	To confirm a work program within budget	Local Risk 1 day @ £250/day	250																						
<b>Total</b>			2750																						
<p><b>3. Governance arrangements</b></p>	<p><i>Service Committee responsible:</i> Epping Forest and Commons Committee</p>																								

	<p><i>Senior Responsible Officer:</i> Paul Thomson (Assistant Director Epping Forest and Wanstead Park)</p> <p><i>Project Board:</i> COVID Path Works project board in place. Memberships comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paul Thomson, Assistant Director (Epping Forest and Wanstead Park)</li> <li>• Jacqueline Eggleston, Head of Visitor Services (Epping Forest)</li> <li>• Geoff Sinclair Head of Operations (Epping Forest)</li> <li>• Andy Froud Biodiversity Officer (Epping Forest)</li> </ul>
--	---

### Project Summary

<p><b>4. Context</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Paths and their verges across the Epping Forest Special Area for Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) suffered significant environmental damage due to abnormally high visitor use during the COVID lockdown period. (See 5.2 below)</li> <li>2. Following an audit of the 198 km of managed paths at Epping Forest, 14% of the path network was found to require urgent works to repair the most severe impacts of the high visitor use to address Health &amp; Safety concerns, mitigate environmental damage and improve public safety. The estimated cost of these works was £377,364.</li> <li>3. These works are over and above the BAU path and verge management program.</li> <li>4. A maximum request of £250,000 is being made to the COL with a range of external funding options being actively explored to fund the difference in the costs, including local authority funding through Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) programs and through the Countryside Stewardship Scheme.</li> </ol>
<p><b>5. Brief description of project</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In responding to the damaging environmental impact of the high visitor use on the Forest's path network two broad management objectives have been identified: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To improve the Health and Safety of core paths and reduce the environmental impact of visitors on the verge areas</li> <li>b. To reduce the spread of visitors in high use areas to fewer paths better able to cope with the use.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Damaged paths were triaged based on the severity of damage and their importance from a visitor access point of view. Overall, 59 paths were identified as requiring works</li> </ol>

	<p>representing a total length of 27,680 m or 14% of the total path network. The work required falls into four activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Surfacing of a path to provide a robust surface to ensure users do not impact path verges and to deter them from forming nearby desire lines</li> <li>b. Path works to repair damage and to improve the accessibility of paths to deter users from damaging path verges <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Pothole repairs</li> <li>ii. Improvements to wet path sections to provide a dry pathway</li> <li>iii. Drainage works to promote a dry path surface</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<p><b>3. Consequences if project not approved</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public safety: The physical damage to path surfaces has made for difficult uneven access with particular problems for cyclists if they come across damaged sections at speed presenting health and safety and public liability risks.</li> <li>2. SAC/SSSI condition: An estimated 93.2 ha of path verge were severely impacted by the high visitor use which if not repaired will lead to permanent environmental damage and possible reversal of generally improving SSSI condition assessments by Natural England</li> <li>3. The much poorer quality access, especially in winter, due to the high visitor use damage will be an increasing public concern and long-term source of public complaint if at least the worst sections in the higher use areas are not addressed.</li> </ol>
<p><b>4. SMART project objectives</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4,510 m of new path constructed for Dec 2024 to provide a robust surface to ensure users do not impact path verges and to deter them from forming nearby desire lines</li> <li>2. 13,000 m of paths repaired for Dec 2024 to improve the accessibility of paths to deter users from damaging path verges</li> <li>3. Drainage improvements undertaken on 21,000m of path for Dec 2024 to promote a robust all-weather surface</li> </ol>
<p><b>5. Key benefits</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Feb/Mar 2021 path audit to be used as a baseline assessment (Appendix 1)</li> <li>2. Reduced visitor impact on path verges and restoration of the natural vegetation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 90% less red level damage due to visitor impact on path verges a year following works.</li> <li>b) 50% less amber level damage due to visitor impact on path verges a year following works</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Reduced spread of visitors in high use areas to fewer paths better able to cope with use. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 90% reduction in red level pathway condition a year following works</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

	b) 50 % reduction in amber pathway condition a year following works
<b>6. Project category</b>	1. Health and safety
<b>7. Project priority</b>	A. Essential
<b>8. Notable exclusions</b>	None

### Options Appraisal

<b>9. Overview of options</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposals represent a triaged program based on the severity of damage and their importance from a visitor access point of view and covers 14% of the Epping Forest managed path network. <b>The works are estimated to cost £377,364 ,however, it is proposed that a COL funding cap be adopted of £250,000 and the remainder of the funding found through external sources.</b></li> <li>2. <b>External funding is being sought through the SANGS and SAMM programs established to support mitigation works arising from new development close to the Epping Forest Special for Conservation and also through the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Countryside Stewardship program, any funding achieved from these will follow separate committee reporting procedures.</b></li> <li>3. Failing additional external funding the project budget would be capped at £250,000 and we would value engineer works to remain within this e.g., the following options will be explored: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Full proposed 4510m path surfacing program undertaken with path damage repair works undertaken as budget allows.</li> <li>b) Partial path surfacing program undertaken with increased path damage repair works program.</li> <li>c) Full path damage repair works program implemented and path surfacing undertaken as budget allows.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
-------------------------------	---

### Project Planning

<b>10. Delivery period and key dates</b>	<p><b>Overall project:</b> Two years from start of project with completion March 2025</p> <p><b>Key dates:</b></p> <p>31<sup>st</sup> October 2022: Additional consents for work in Archaeological Protection Areas (APA) confirmed with the responsible Local Authorities</p>
--	--

	<p>30<sup>th</sup> November 2022: Formal consent for these works will be required from Natural England under Section 28E of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) for the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and as required under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 in relation to the Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> December 2022: Gateway 3/4 reporting</p> <p>20<sup>th</sup> January 2023: Path works tender let</p> <p>TBC March 2023: Gateway 5 reporting</p> <p><b>Other works dates to coordinate:</b> <i>None.</i></p>
<p><b>11. Risk implications</b></p>	<p><b>Overall project risk:</b> Low</p> <p>CRP: The nature of the works is that the scale can be reduced through not undertaking some actions to ensure the costs fit the budget available, however, this would leave significant health and safety liabilities.</p> <p>Statutory consents: Consent may not be forthcoming or require significant investment to achieve. Affected locations will be reprioritised for later working subject to funding</p> <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2)</p>
<p><b>12. Stakeholders and consultees</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Neil Fuller, Natural England: Statutory consultee within the SSSI and SAC area</li> <li>2. Chris Laine, Historic England: Statutory consultee within Wanstead Park</li> <li>3. Local Authorities: London Boroughs of Waltham Forest and Redbridge, Essex Country Council and Epping Forest District Council for APA issues and possible need for planning permission</li> <li>4. Epping Forest Consultative Committee</li> <li>5. Epping Forest and Commons Committee</li> <li>6. Beatrix Jako, Finance</li> <li>7. James Carter, Commercial Service.</li> </ol>

**Resource Implications**

<p><b>13. Total estimated cost</b></p>	<p><b>Likely cost range (excluding risk):</b> £250,000 (COL budget capped at £250,000 additional funding options are still being explored to reach the full Gateway 1 project costs of <b>£377,364</b>).</p>
--	--

	<b>Likely cost range (including risk): £250,000 (COL budget capped at £250,000 additional funding options are still being explored to reach the full Gateway 1 project costs of £377,364)</b>																		
<b>14. Funding strategy</b>	Choose 1: All funding fully guaranteed	Choose 1: Internal - Funded wholly by City's own resource																	
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Funds/Sources of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Capital bid approved for 2022/23</td> <td>250,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>250,000</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	Capital bid approved for 2022/23	250,000												<b>Total</b>	<b>250,000</b>
	Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)																	
Capital bid approved for 2022/23	250,000																		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>250,000</b>																	
<b>15. Investment appraisal</b>	N/A																		
<b>16. Procurement strategy/route to market</b>	The works will be procured through the COL's highway term contractor in the first instance and depending on the outcome may be competitively tendered through the Commercial Service team. It is proposed that the works be awarded to a single contractor to deliver the entirety of the works.																		
<b>17. Legal implications</b>	<p>1. Formal consent for these works is required from Natural England under Section 28E of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) for the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and as required under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 in relation to the Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Additional consents for work in locally listed landscapes and APAs will be sought as required.</p> <p>2. Many of the damaged paths often lie within the SAC and the important issue here is that works on these could be subject to Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) to assess Likely Significant Effects (LSEs), not just subject to SSSI assents. The reason for this is that the surfacing of rides may not necessarily be considered as required for managing the features of the SAC. However, there is also an argument that the rides prevent damage to SAC features and are an established asset in the Forest. However, some surfaced rides</p>																		

	<p><i>have undoubtedly killed ancient Beech or significantly impacted on their condition</i></p> <p><i>3. Subject to the provisions of the Epping Forest Acts 1878 &amp; 1880 the Conservators are under a duty at all times to keep Epping Forest uninclosed and unbuilt on as an open space for the recreation and enjoyment of the public. They are also under a duty at all times as far as possible to preserve the natural aspect of the Forest.</i></p> <p><i>4. The Epping Forest Act 1880 includes an additional power at section 5 to maintain "ornamental inclosed lands" which most probably reflects the City Corporation's purchase of Wanstead Park in 1880 and requires the Conservators to make proper provision for securing the enjoyment thereof by the public for exercise and recreation at all reasonable times during the day.</i></p>
<b>18. Corporate property implications</b>	None
<b>19. Traffic implications</b>	None
<b>20. Sustainability and energy implications</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The works in the report will contribute to the improved resilience of the Epping Forest SSSI and SAC to meeting extreme storm events.</li> <li>2. Many shared use trails are in danger of being compromised to their sub-base foundations, investment now will alleviate the need for more expensive future repairs.</li> </ol>
<b>21. IS implications</b>	None
<b>22. Equality Impact Assessment</b>	<p><i>An equality impact assessment will not be undertaken</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The works will ensure the accessibility of the Forest in a sustainable way. It is considered that there are no negative impacts on the protected equality groups.</li> </ol>
<b>23. Data Protection Impact Assessment</b>	<i>The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact assessment will not be undertaken</i>

## Appendices

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Project Briefing
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Risk Register
<b>Appendix 3</b>	



**Contact**

<b>Report Author</b>	Geoff Sinclair
<b>Email Address</b>	geoff.sinclair@cityoflondon.gov.uk
<b>Telephone Number</b>	07860 595 376

This page is intentionally left blank

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

## Project Briefing

Project identifier			
<b>[1a] Unique Project Identifier</b>		<b>[1b] Departmental Reference Number</b>	N/A
<b>[2] Core Project Name</b>	<i>Epping Forest: COVID-19 damage to Shared Use Trail network</i>		
<b>[3] Programme Affiliation</b> <i>(If applicable)</i>	N/A Standalone project		

Ownership	
<b>[4] Chief Officer has signed off on this document</b>	<Confirmation of having read and agreed with the content of this document>
<b>[5] Senior Responsible Officer</b>	Paul Thomson
<b>[6] Project Manager</b>	Geoff Sinclair

Description and purpose	
<b>[7] Project Description</b>	
<p>Paths and their verges across the Epping Forest Special Area for Conservation suffered significant environmental damage due to abnormally high visitor use during the COVID lockdown period. 14% of the path network requires urgent works to repair the most severe impacts to mitigate environmental damage and improve public safety.</p>	
<b>[8] Definition of Need: What is the problem we are trying to solve or opportunity we are trying to realise (i.e., the reasons why we should make a change)?</b>	
<p>Epping Forest has 198 km of paths. 36 km (18.2%) of these paths are all-weather paths and have a hard surfacing and sub-surfacing comprising of a variety of materials. 162 km (81.8%) have a natural surface. Visitor numbers across Epping Forest in 2020/21 were three to five times greater than the average year. The 162 km of natural surfaced paths, in particular, have suffered considerable adverse physical impacts due the high visitor use. In addition, this increased visitor use has seen many new paths created or previously low use desire paths become more intensely used leading to a widening of the path network and damage to the surface of the Forest and increased compaction around the roots of many veteran trees. The wet weather of the winter of 2020/21 and the Spring of 2021 has further exacerbated the impact of the high visitor use.</p> <p>During February and March 2021 Epping Forest staff undertook an assessment of the condition of the managed path network across Epping Forest and the Buffer lands with the findings of the path condition audit detailed in Appendix one. Surveyed paths were divided into three zones, Zone 1 - the pathway, Zone 2 – the path verge and Zone 3 a wider indeterminate accessible area beyond the immediate path verge of Zone 2.</p> <p>Key observations arising from the audit were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surfaced paths lead to a significant reduction in environmental damage to both the verge (Zone 2) and the wider verge area (Zone 3). 76% of unsurfaced paths</li> </ul>	

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

(zone 1) were found to be in a poor to very poor condition as opposed to 24% of surfaced paths.

- 93.2 ha of verges along unsurfaced paths have been severely impacted by visitor use.
- The 17% of severely impacted verge on the zone 3 of unsurfaced path is concerning as it highlights areas of wider environmental damage to paths as people seek to avoid damaged sections and thereby adversely impact areas not previously walked. This represents an area of 23.5 ha that has been permanently adversely impacted.

Damaged paths were triaged based on the severity of damage and their importance from a visitor access point of view. Overall, 59 paths were identified as requiring works representing a total length of 27,680 m or 14% of the total path network. The work required falls into four activities:

- a. Surfacing of a path to provide a robust surface to ensure users do not impact path verges and to deter them from forming nearby desire lines
- b. Path works to repair damage and to improve the accessibility of paths to deter users from damaging path verges
  - i. Pothole repairs
  - ii. Improvements to wet path sections to provide a dry pathway
  - iii. Drainage works to promote a dry path surface

#### **[9] What is the link to the City of London Corporate plan outcomes?**

[2] People enjoy good health and wellbeing.

[9] Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained.

[10] Our physical spaces have clean air, land and water and support a thriving and sustainable natural environment.

[11] Our spaces are digitally and physically well-connected and responsive.

[12] Our spaces inspire excellence, enterprise, creativity and collaboration.

#### **[10] What is the link to the departmental business plan objectives?**

The Project delivers actions related to four outcomes on the Open spaces 2021-22 Business plan:

- “Our open spaces, heritage and cultural assets are protected, conserved and enhanced”: *The project reverses significant environmental damage caused to the Epping Forest Special for Conservation during by high visitor footfall during the COVID crisis.*
- “Our spaces are accessible, inclusive and safe”: *Damage to paths during the COVID 19 crisis that led to poor accessibility in the most visited parts of the Epping Forest will be repaired. This will improve accessibility and safety, especially for cyclists.*
- “Our habitats are flourishing, biodiverse and resilient to change”: *Works to mitigate significant environmental damage made to 116.7 ha of internationally protected wildlife habitat will be*

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

<p>undertaken. The works will improve the resilience of the paths to withstand future extreme conditions, including adverse weather events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “People feel welcome and included”: The improvement of the condition of the paths concerned will ensure greater year-round accessibility and present a more welcoming prospect for visitors.</li> </ul>					
<b>[11] Note all which apply:</b>					
<b>Officer:</b> Project developed from Officer initiation	Y	<b>Member:</b> Project developed from Member initiation	Y	<b>Corporate:</b> Project developed as a large scale Corporate initiative	N
<b>Mandatory:</b> Compliance with legislation, policy and audit	Y	<b>Sustainability:</b> Essential for business continuity	Y	<b>Improvement:</b> New opportunity/ idea that leads to improvement	N

<b>Project Benchmarking:</b>
<b>[12] What are the top 3 measures of success which will indicate that the project has achieved its aims?</b> <These should be impacts of the activity to complete the aim/objective, rather than ‘finishes on time and on budget’>>
1) 4510 m of new path constructed to provide a robust surface to ensure users do not impact path verges and to deter them from forming nearby desire lines
2) 13,000 m of paths repaired to improve the accessibility of paths to deter users from damaging path verges
3) 21,000 m of paths with drainage improvements to promote a robust all-weather surface
<b>[13] Will this project have any measurable legacy benefits/outcome that we will need to track after the end of the ‘delivery’ phase? If so, what are they and how will you track them? (E.g., cost savings, quality etc.)</b>
Reduced environmental damage to paths and verges in the Epping Forest Special Area for Conservation. Repeat of the path and verge survey on the paths worked after three winters use.
<b>[14] What is the expected delivery cost of this project (range values)[£]?</b>
Lower Range estimate: £250,000 Upper Range estimate: £377,364 (Appendix One)
<b>[15] Total anticipated on-going revenue commitment post-delivery (lifecycle costs)[£]:</b>
New surfaced path maintenance. The nature of these capital works is that maintenance works are minimal on the path surface and work is focussed on the maintenance of the associated drainage features.
Culvert maintenance: 3 days for a COL team of two (£560/day) responding to blockages and cleaning key culverts. £1680
Vegetation management of ditches Cut on a <i>circa</i> three-year cycle 5000m @ £0.16/m £800/year
Reactive maintenance of repaired ditches: 2 days for COL team (£560/day) to clear blockages and ensure free movement of water. £1120
<b>[16] What are the expected sources of funding for this project?</b>
Local Risk

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

<b>[17] What is the expected delivery timeframe for this project (range values)? Are there any deadlines which must be met (e.g., statutory obligations)?</b>
Lower Range estimate: start – 30/03/2024 Upper Range estimate: start – 30/12/2024
Natural England: Permission to undertake works needs to consented by Natural England prior to commencement

<b>Project Impact:</b>	
<b>[18] Will this project generate public or media impact and response which the City of London will need to manage? Will this be a high-profile activity with public and media momentum?</b>	
It is very likely the works will generate public and media communication needs. To a large extent it would be a very good news story and something the COL would wish to promote and would get good key stakeholder support.	
The nature of the works can be seen as intrusive, and some may find this a reason to comment and communications pre and during works will be required	
<b>[19] Who has been actively consulted to develop this project to this stage?</b> <(Add additional internal or external stakeholders where required) >	
Chamberlains: Finance	Beatrix Jako
Chamberlains: Procurement	James Carter
IT	Officer Name:
HR	Officer Name:
Communications	Officer Name:
Corporate Property	Officer Name:
External	
<b>[20] Is this project being delivered internally on behalf of another department? If not ignore this question. If so: Please note the Client supplier departments. Who will be the Officer responsible for the designing of the project? If the supplier department will take over the day-to-day responsibility for the project, when will this occur in its design and delivery?</b>	
Client	Department:
Supplier	Department:
Supplier	Department:
Project Design Manager	Department:
Design/Delivery handover to Supplier	Gateway stage: <Before Project Proposal>, <Post Project Proposal>, <Post Options Appraisal>, <Post Detailed design>, <Post Authority to start work>

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name:		Epping Forest: COVID-19 damage to Shared Use Trails		PM's overall risk rating:	Medium		CRP requested this gateway	£ -		Average unmitigated risk	10.2		Open Risks	13											
Unique project identifier:		TBC		Total estimated cost (exc risk):	£ 250,000		Total CRP used to date	£ -		Average mitigated risk	5.9		Closed Risks	0											
General risk classification																									
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification in pre-mitigation	Impact Classification in pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigation actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification on post-mitigation	Impact Classification on post-mitigation	Costed impact post-mitigation (£)	Post-Mitigation risk score	CRP used to date	Use of CRP	Ownership & Action	Risk owner (Named Officer or External Party)	Date Closed OR/ Realised & moved to issues	Comment(s)			
R1	2	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	Injury to users, especially cyclists, coming across the damaged paths at speed	Public liability claims against the City Corporation and the need to defend and possibly compensate for	Likely	Extreme	32	£0.00	N		The project seeks to address this issue on the well used paths which unfortunately the heavy COVID uses has made works. The only mitigation will be the closure of significant paths where problems increase, as they will do over the winter months	£0.00	Likely	Extreme	£0.00	32	£0.00		15-Aug-22	Geoff Sinclair	Paul Thomson		Risk should the project not take place: Without the works or closure of the paths, most of which are main, well used routes, the risks will persist		
R2	2	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	Injury to users walking on very uneven terrain along managed paths	Public liability claims against the City Corporation and the need to defend and possibly compensate for	Likely	Serious	8	£0.00	N		The project seeks to address this issue on the well used paths which unfortunately the heavy COVID uses has made works. The only mitigation will be the closure of significant paths where problems increase, as they will do over the winter months	£0.00	Likely	Serious	£0.00	8	£0.00		15-Aug-22	Geoff Sinclair	Paul Thomson		Risk should the project not take place: Without the works or closure of the paths, most of which are main, well used routes, the risks will persist		
R3	2	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Statutory action is taken by Natural England	The City of London Corporation if forced to carry out work within a fixed three year period.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		Early engagement with NE will evidence the COL work towards a solution and will	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		15-Aug-22	Geoff Sinclair	Paul Thomson		Gateway 2 onwards risk		
R4	2	(3) Reputation	Exception is taken to the project or elements of the project by one or a number of stakeholder groups.	This results in Legal and other Action against the City Corporation and the need to defend.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		Early engagement with stakeholder groups detailing works and local publicity where significant actions are proposed will help to assuage some local concerns.	£0.00	Rare	Serious	£0.00	2	£0.00		15-Aug-22	Geoff Sinclair	Paul Thomson		Gateway 5 onwards risk: Generally speaking improvements to the path networks will be well received as the damage was very extensive and impact to users		
R5	2	(3) Reputation	Key staff members leave the organisation.	Staff leaving reduces momentum for the project and results in a loss of institutional memory.	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Should a staff member leave additional organisational resource should be secured to carry on their duties. This should include the opportunity for a thorough handover supported by detailed project plans.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		15-Aug-22	Geoff Sinclair	Paul Thomson		Gateway 2 onwards risk		
R6	2	(9) Environmental	Design does not deliver an appropriate scheme.	There is an adverse impact on the natural environment This would damage the City Corporation's relationship with the local contractual England	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	N		Internal ecologists will review works and the works will also be assessed by both Natural England and Historic England	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00		15-Aug-22	Geoff Sinclair	Paul Thomson		Gateway 5 onwards risk		
R7	2	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Planning permission (if required) is denied by Local Authority	This would cause delays in programme in either challenging the decision or changing the design.	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	N		Proposed path surfacing follows existing well used routes and promotes improvements to the SSSVIC and accessibility.	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00		15-Aug-22	Geoff Sinclair	Paul Thomson		Gateway 4/5 Risk		
R8	2	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Objections are raised by involved statutory bodies (ie Historic England/Natural England)	This would cause delays in programme in either challenging the decision or changing the design.	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Early engagement with stakeholder groups detailing works will help to assuage some local concerns. Path surfacing follows existing routes that have been significant damage and the work will reduce impact on the protected characters.	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00		15-Aug-22	Geoff Sinclair	Paul Thomson		Gateway 4/5 Risk		
R9	2	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	Trespass to construction sites.	Potential to delay project should damage be caused.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		Contractor will be required to have security regime and to uphold health and safety requirements for construction sites.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00							Gateway 5 onwards risk	
R10	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	Appointed design contractor goes out of business.	Would delay project and could result in reduced outputs	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	N		Due diligence will be undertaken before appointing all contract to ensure that the appointee is sufficiently capable to undertake the full scope of work	£0.00	Rare	major	£0.00	4	£0.00							Gateway 5 onwards risk	
R11	2	(9) Environmental	Wet ground conditions, especially if unseasonally wet.	May stop or delay some works to avoid them damaging sites further	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Activity scheduling will apportion work streams to times of the year when they will be most achievable	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00							Gateway 5 onwards risk	
R12	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	Difficulty in appointing a contractor	Difficulty in appointing consultants	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Ensure that the role is attractive and competitively funded.	£0.00	Unlikely	Major	£0.00	8	£0.00							Gateway 4/5 Risk	
R13	2	(4) Contractual/Partnership	Complaints of Forest users and neighbours about construction works.	Could damage relationships with key stakeholders	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N		A complaints procedure will be in place were members of the public can raise concerns. This will include feedback to the user on what is being done to resolve the issue. The contractor will be required to communicate to key stakeholders the impact of work in advance.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00								Gateway 5 onwards risk
R14								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00								

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank